

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 012

JC 690 052

By-Tuckman, Bruce W.; Gillie, Angelo C.

A Study of the Role of the Community College in the Development of Self- and Occupational-Concepts. Interim Report.

Rutgers, The State Univ., New Brunswick, N.J. Graduate School of Education.

Pub Date Jul 68

Note-23p.

EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.25

Descriptors-Career Choice, \*College Role, \*Junior Colleges, \*Occupational Aspiration, Role Perception, \*Self Concept, Self Congruence, Self Esteem, Technical Occupations, Vocational Interests

Identifiers-\*New Jersey

This report concerns a study designed to determine the extent to which students in community college occupational programs are developing a heightened self-awareness as well as a heightened occupational awareness when compared to students having different experiences. It is hypothesized that students enrolled in technical programs at Middlesex County College will be aware of a wider variety, a more technical and high level of occupation, and will be inclined to see themselves as more able to attain these occupations than students who have gone into immediate employment upon graduation from high school. The Multiple Repertory Test is being used to measure the following criteria, which are broadly conceived as representing the development of self- and occupational-concepts: (1) self-esteem, or the congruence between actual and ideal self-description; (2) occupational level of incorporation, or the congruence between actual self-description and occupational self-description; and (3) level of incorporation of social roles, or the congruence between actual self-description and social-role-description. The data so far presented are intended only as a baseline, thus no generalizations have been made concerning student change as a result of their two-year college experience. (MC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE  
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS  
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION  
POSITION OR POLICY.

INTERIM REPORT

Report of the First Year's Progress.

A Study of the Role of the Community College  
in the Development of Self- and Occupational- Concepts

Bruce W. Tuckman  
and  
Angelo C. Gillie

Graduate School of Education  
Rutgers - The State University

July 1968

Supported by: The State Department of Education  
Trenton, New Jersey

Under the Auspices of: The Vocational Division

Starting date: August 1, 1967  
Ending date: September 30, 1969

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.  
LOS ANGELES

FEB 24 1968

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR  
JUNIOR COLLEGE  
INFORMATION

## A STUDY OF THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF SELF- AND OCCUPATIONAL- CONCEPTS

### I. Introduction

The function of occupational education at any level is not only to help students develop specific occupational skills, but also to help them gain a greater understanding of their own capabilities and of the requirements of various occupations. Occupational programs in the community college should be expected to help students become more aware of their own present capabilities and developing capabilities as well as making available to them greater information about related occupations. As a result of this growing self-awareness and growing occupational awareness, students should expand upon their expectations of occupational placement, and should begin to see themselves to an increasingly greater extent as having those capabilities required for specific occupations. If the community college is fulfilling this function in its technical programs, then it is performing an important function in addition to the one most commonly ascribed to it, namely the development of skills. If the community college is not fulfilling this function, then more emphasis should be placed upon specific opportunities within the educational program for occupational and self exploration.

The purpose of the proposed study is to determine the extent to which students in community college programs are developing this heightened self-awareness and heightened knowledge of related occupations, when compared to students who are having different experiences. Of specific interest is the comparison that will be made between students enrolled in technical programs in the local community college and students who have gone into immediate employment upon graduation. It is anticipated that students in the community college will be more aware of a wider variety of occupations, of higher level, more technical occupations, and will be more inclined to see themselves as developing the capabilities required for these occupations.

New Jersey is presently making a major commitment to post-secondary education via the community or county two-year colleges. Since a major part of these colleges are terminal technical programs which are intended to prepare students for entry into the world of work at technical and sub-professional levels, it is important that such a commitment be met with attempts to evaluate and understand the effects of this educational opportunity upon the students for whom it is made available. In the absence of such attempts to understand and evaluate, it will be difficult to insure that technical post-secondary programs are meeting the various objectives which were set forth for them. Since New Jersey is at present pioneering in major county college development, it seems appropriate that New Jersey also begin pioneering activities in understanding the effects of community college experiences on students.

Therefore, the major objective of this study will be to attempt to discover what effect, if any, the two-year college experience has on students in terms of their development of self-concept, i.e., knowledge of what they themselves are like, and development of occupational concepts, i.e., knowledge of those capabilities required for selected occupations. To the extent to which these two areas of concepts are comparable we would expect the student to be able to make a smooth transition from the community college to that occupation in which his greatest strength lies.

## II. Problem

Students who would not otherwise have a college experience are afforded this opportunity through the 2 year college movement. Some of these students pursue 2 year occupational programs, while others prepare for continuation in a 4 year college. One can question the effect that this college experience has on the way the student perceives himself and the way he perceives various occupations.

One would expect that the opportunity for a student to conceive of himself as a college student would affect his self-esteem and the manner in which he views occupations and social roles that have hitherto been beyond his range of possibilities.

The three criteria to be investigated in this study are:

1. Self-esteem: the congruence between actual self description and ideal self description.
2. Occupational level of incorporation: the amount of congruence between actual self description and occupational description (closeness of fit)?
3. Level of incorporation of social roles: the amount of congruence between actual self description and social role description?

Example of social roles:

- a) Productive member of society
- b) Creative person
- c) Good neighbor
- d) Community leader

All three criteria may be broadly conceived of as representing the development of self- and occupational- concepts.

An attempt will be made to determine the extent to which the community college experience affects the development of self- and occupational-



concepts. The examination will be both cross-sectional and longitudinal in nature. Not only will students enrolled in community college programs be followed over a two year period but they will also be compared at the end of this period with (a) terminal high school graduates: students graduating from high school but not pursuing any additional formal education, (b) university students: students enrolled in the College of Arts & Sciences at Rutgers - The State University.

Specifically, three exploratory questions will be examined:

1. What is the effect of community college experience (considering occupational and liberal arts programs separately) on self-esteem as compared to alternative experiences (non-college and university)? That is, to what extent does the community college experience enhance the individual's perception of his actual self relative to his ideal self?
2. What is the effect of community college experience (considering occupational and liberal arts programs separately, and considering the different occupational programs separately) on occupational level of incorporation as compared to alternative experiences (non-college and university)? That is, to what extent does the community college experience (and the different curriculum experiences) cause the individual's perception of himself to become more similar to his perception of selected occupations by virtue of an enhanced ability to differentiate within the self and within and between more occupations of different skill levels.
3. What is the effect of community college experiences (considering occupational and liberal arts programs separately, and considering the different occupational programs separately) on the level of incorporation of social roles as compared to alternative experiences (non-college and university)? That is, to what extent does the community college experience (and the different curriculum experiences) cause the individual's perception of himself to become more similar to his perception of his selected social roles by virtue of an enhanced ability to differentiate within the self and within and between more social roles.

One value of the community college to society and to the students it serves is in its effect on the way the student sees himself and his occupational goals. If this value is being realized, then it should manifest itself in a heightened self-esteem and a greater awareness of self with respect to the spectrum of occupations. If this value is not being realized, then community colleges must make greater efforts to help students implement their self-concepts through exposure to a wider possibility of occupational alternatives. The findings of this study can be applied to deter-

mining whether the community college is in fact realizing its full potential in helping students to implement and supplement their self-concepts.

Furthermore, if we are to fully understand the role of adolescence and education as they affect individual development and the fulfillment of individual and societal needs, then we must determine the role of all educational institutions on the development of self-concepts.

### III. Method

#### A. Sample

Three groups (all Middlesex County residents) were identified and tested as follows:

- 1) Entering male students in Middlesex County College (the entire group of 700 was tested. From these samples from the various programs were drawn).
  - a). Occupational programs (231 students)
    - i. Pre-technical program (51 students)
    - ii. Business program (117 students)
    - iii. Combined Electronics and Chemical Technician programs (63 students)
  - b). Liberal arts program (74 students)
- 2) Entering male students in Rutgers College of Arts & Sciences (93 students)
- 3) Non-college bound male high school graduates (35 students).\*

B. Identification of the independent variable: The independent variable was the nature of the two-year experience obtained immediately following high school graduation. Six experiences were:

- 1a. i.). community college occupational program (students) - Pre-technical
  - ii.). community college occupational program (students) - Business
  - iii.). Community college occupational program (students) - Technical
  - 2). university liberal arts (students)
  - 3). non-college
- 1b). community college liberal arts program*

The independent variable was manipulated through the selection of subjects as indicated in the previous section.

#### C. Measurement of the dependent variables

\* An attempt was made to obtain a sample of 100. However, even though \$5.00 was offered for one hour of testing, only 35 members of this population would participate.

1) Self-esteem:

The Multiple Repertory Test (MRT), as developed and used by Matlin and Starishevsky (1962), Bingham (1966), and Rampel (1967) was used to measure each of the dependent variables (an example of this instrument has been appended). Students are given a form of the Role Construct Repertory Test (Kelly, 1955) on which they indicate the dimensions that they use for "reading" their environment. They are then given a form of the Semantic Differential and copy on to it those adjectives generated on the Role Construct Repertory Test. Each administration of the Semantic Differential uses a different target to be rated. For the measure of self-esteem, these included:

- a). I am (self-description)
- b). I wish I were (ideal self)

Self-esteem was measured by the reciprocal of the discrepancy between actual and ideal self ratings.

2) Occupational level of incorporation (O-L/I):

The same general procedure as outlined above is used. Students rate: (1) I am (self-description), (2) selected occupations. O-L/I is measured for each occupation as the reciprocal of the discrepancy between the description of that occupation by the student and his self-description.

Occupations chosen are shown in Table 1. They are listed in order of status based on the index developed by Reiss (1961). Moreover, these occupations fall into (roughly) technical, business, and social categories.

3) Level of incorporation of Social Roles (SR-L/I):

The same procedure as outlined above is used. SR-L/I is measured for each social role as the reciprocal of the discrepancy between the description of that social role by the student and his self-description. The four social roles chosen are shown in Table 2.

D. Procedures Already Accomplished

- 1) Arrangements were made with the President of Middlesex County College and Dean of Students at Rutgers - The State University to conduct a testing program.\* Samples from

\* We would like to thank Frank Chambers - President of Middlesex County College, Michael Reynolds - Dean of Students at Middlesex, Howard J. Crosby - Dean of Men at Rutgers College and George Kramer - Director of Admissions at Rutgers for their help in getting students to participate in the study.

TABLE I

A Listing of the Fourteen Occupations Appearing in the MRT with Their Rank-Ordering in Terms of Status (Reiss, 1961) and Grouping in Terms of Technical, Business, and Social

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Category</u>
1.5	Lawyer	(Social)
1.5	Doctor	(Technical)
3.5	Business Executive	(Business)
3.5	Engineer	(Technical)
5	Accountant (CPA)	(Business)
6	Teacher	(Social)
7	Technician	(Technical)
8	Bookkeeper	(Business)
9	Salesman	(Social)
10.5	Clerk	(Business)
10.5	Electrician or Plumber	(Technical)
12	Policeman or Fireman	(Social)
13	Mechanic or Machinist	(Technical)
14	Truck Driver or Deliveryman	(Social)

TABLE II

A Listing of the Four Social Roles Appearing in the MRT

Member of High Society

Outstanding Citizen

Cultured Person

Community Leader



these two sources were drawn randomly to fit the groupings in the section on Sample. The MRT was administered to these samples in September, 1967.\*

- 2) Principals of three large Middlesex County high schools were contacted and asked to provide names of non-college bound graduates. From those names a sample was contacted for the September 1967 testing session. Each participant was offered \$5.00. Because of the small number appearing, an ad was put in the local newspaper. In all, only few of this group would participate.
- 3) Data collected in September 1967 was analyzed and is reported on in the next section of this report. Mean rank-orderings of the level of incorporation of occupations by each of the six groups (see Section B) were calculated and compared to one another and to the ordering based on status (see Table 1). In addition, level of incorporation scores for ideal self, the occupations, and social roles for each group were submitted to a one-way analysis of variance.
- 4) Information about major was obtained during the first testing session from all college students. Information on number of schools applied to and relative preference of the County College was obtained from Middlesex County College students at the original testing.

#### E. Procedures to be Accomplished

- 1) In May, 1969 the graduating class of Middlesex County College will be given the MRT again. Data from students who have dropped out will be removed from the original rostering sample and will be replaced with data from graduating students (from whom original data was collected but not rostered to maintain the sample size).
- 2) In May, 1969 those persons in the Rutgers University sample still at Rutgers will be contacted and given the MRT again. No attempt will be made to follow the drop-outs. Each participant from this group will be paid \$5.00 to be retested.
- 3) In May, 1969 the non-college sample will be retested. Each participant from this group will be paid \$5.00 to be retested.
- 4) Changes in self-esteem, level of incorporation of occupations (i.e., perceived similarity between self and occupation), and level of incorporation of social roles (i.e. perceived similar-

\* In fact, all the entering male freshmen in Middlesex County Community College were tested, and a sample was drawn from among these for rostering and analysis.

ty between self and social role) will be subjected to a one-way analysis of variance. The six groupings (see Section B) will be the independent variable. Separate analysis will be done for each occupation and each social role. Moreover, mean rank-orderings of the level of incorporation scores of occupations by the different groups will be compared to one another and to the status list. This will be accomplished for data from the second testing and for ranking changes from the first to the second testing.

#### IV. Interim Results

##### A. Calculations

Each person made up 12 rating scales on which he rated the 20 objects (I am, I wish I were, 14 occupations, 4 social roles) using a seven-point scale (see Appendix). Thus, each rater rated each object 12 times, giving, in each case, a rating of from one to seven. Thus, each person gave a total of 240 (12 X 20) ratings. Each person's rating on each of the 12 scales for 19 of the objects was then subtracted from his rating on the corresponding scale for the object: "I am." Thus, on each of the 12 scales a discrepancy between "I am" and each of the other 19 objects is obtained. The 12 discrepancies for each object (subtracted from "I am") are then converted to absolute values and summed, giving 19 discrepancy scores for each person, one for each object minus "I am." Each of these 19 discrepancy scores is called the level of incorporation of that object (meaning the extent to which the self is seen as similar or different from that object). In previous work this discrepancy score has been divided into one to get its reciprocal. For this study, the discrepancy score was used as the level of incorporation score.

##### B. Rank-Orderings of Discrepancy Scores on the Occupations

The discrepancy scores on each occupation were averaged across the members of each group to get mean discrepancy scores for each occupation for each group. The rank-ordering of the discrepancy scores on each occupation for each group along with the mean discrepancy scores appears in the Appendix. Discrepancy scores for each occupation could vary from a low of 0 to a high of 72. In fact, these means ranged from 18.52 to 32.59.

Rank-order correlations (Spearman's rho) were calculated between the rank-orderings of the discrepancy or level of incorporation scores on occupations for the six groups and between each group and that based on status level (see Table 1). The resulting matrix of 21 correlations appears in Table 3.

As can be seen from this table, there is a high initial similarity between the rankings of the Middlesex County College Technical and Liberal Arts students, and the Rutgers College group. Intercorrelation among the three range from .76 to .86. Moreover, the correlations between the rankings of these three groups and the status list range from .62 to .77.

The Business students at Middlesex County College show an intermediate relation to the other five groups (rhos between .24 and .47) and an intermediate relation to the status list (rho = .46).

The non-college group also relates at an intermediate level to the other groups and the status list.

The Middlesex County College Pre-Technical students differ markedly as a group from the others. Their inter-correlations range from .24 to -.31 and they correlate -.46 with the status list. Based on this you could say that the Pre-Technical group has the lowest self-concept of the six groups.

#### C. Analyses of Variance of the Discrepancy Scores

Discrepancy scores for each of the 19 stimulus words (i.e., each word minus "I am") were subjected to one-way analyses of variance using the unweighted means solution to deal with unequal cell entries. These results appear in Table 4. Significant differences were found on 12 of the 19 words, i.e., two of the four social roles, and 10 of the 14 occupations. No significant differences were found on the self-concept word (I wish I were - I am).

Those occupations showing differences of the greatest significance were clerk, bookkeeper, truck driver/deliveryman, salesman, accountant, business executive, and electrician/plumber. Four of these occupations are in the business cluster and were identified with by students who had chosen the business major in the community college. Other occupations showing significance were engineer, technician, and doctor, all in the technical cluster.

Among the social roles, cultured person and outstanding citizen showed significance while high society and community leader did not.

#### V. Discussion

It is obvious from the data that some pre-selection goes into the process of students entering schools and curriculums, even as regards their

TABLE III

Rank-Order Correlations Between the Discrepancy Score  
Orderings for the Six Groups on the Fourteen Occupations

	RC	MCC LA	MCC Tech	MCC Bus	MCC Pre-T	Non Coll	SL
Rutgers College N=93	---	.78	.86	.36	-.31	.57	.62
Middlesex County College Liberal Arts N=74		---	.76	.47	.02	.66	.76
MCC Combined Technical N=63			---	.35	-.27	.58	.77
MCC Business N=117				---	.24	.35	.46
MCC Pre-Technical N=51					---	.20	-.46
Non-College N=35						---	.21
Status Level List							---



TABLE IV

Means and Analysis of Variance of the Discrepancy Scores  
for the 19 Stimulus Words (Each Word Minus "I am")

	Rutgers College	Non- College	M.C.C. liberal arts	M.C.C. pre-tech.	M.C.C. technical	M.C.C. business	MS <sub>D</sub>	MS <sub>W</sub>	F <sup>†</sup>
I wish I were	19.03	21.46	22.08	22.92	18.73	21.67	202.1	103.6	1.95
elec./plumber	27.83	25.00	25.67	22.80	22.19	25.35	304.9	87.1	3.50**
high society	26.31	26.46	24.67	26.35	23.28	24.48	109.3	91.4	1.20
teacher	22.31	24.17	21.59	24.10	21.55	21.61	82.6	71.1	1.16
accountant	25.40	28.14	24.73	23.49	21.90	21.37	375.5	94.9	3.95**
clerk	30.21	27.83	24.68	21.67	25.60	23.38	715.6	105.2	6.80**
outstdg. cit.	21.17	25.28	22.40	22.41	19.35	21.55	177.6	66.8	2.66*
salesman	26.59	24.91	22.16	21.00	24.08	22.50	308.5	75.4	4.09**
doctor	23.00	26.54	23.15	25.27	20.78	24.20	207.7	86.3	2.41*
tr.dr/deliv.	32.59	30.88	28.34	25.11	29.81	28.40	433.0	105.4	4.11**
cultured per.	21.10	26.28	20.59	21.41	20.09	21.78	202.2	69.2	2.92*
mech./mach.	26.52	25.48	26.00	23.16	23.11	24.96	138.5	82.5	1.68
engineer	21.93	24.57	22.77	23.69	18.94	22.84	210.7	72.9	2.89*
comm. leader	22.24	25.43	22.52	23.27	21.41	22.30	82.9	83.5	0.99
technician	21.76	24.63	22.59	22.12	18.52	21.83	200.9	73.0	2.75*
bus. exec.	23.98	24.94	23.75	23.25	20.30	20.33	281.2	76.6	3.67**
bookkeeper	27.18	26.31	25.34	21.08	23.19	20.72	594.1	89.6	6.63**
lawyer	22.75	26.20	24.15	25.18	21.79	22.38	159.1	84.2	1.89
police./fire.	27.02	26.08	24.99	22.94	24.70	23.35	188.4	85.9	2.19

\*  $p < .05$  ( $2.23 < p < 3.06$ )

\*\*  $p < .01$  ( $p > 3.06$ )

<sup>†</sup>df = 5,426

occupational outlooks. The Middlesex County College Pre-Technical students show the highest identification (perhaps realistically) with low status occupations. The MCC business student group identifies most closely with business occupations and the MCC technical group with technical occupations. The non-college group shows the least specific identification with any occupation among the six groups tested.

The similarity in occupational identification among the three groups: Rutgers College, MCC liberal arts students, and MCC technical students is striking. It must be remembered that all testing was done at the very beginning of the college year. None of the students had actually begun their college course-work. Thus, any differences that occurred were a function of prior experiences, perceptions of one's own ability and talents, and the decision to pursue a particular curriculum at a particular school. This latter factor could well be an important determinant.

The purpose of this study is to determine the effects of a particular two-year experience. Whether these two years serve to sharpen ~~the~~ the original differences or to level them is an empirical question to be answered by the final data. However, since some groups such as the business group already show marked identification with the business occupations, the effect of the two-year program may well serve to sharpen the differences between groups in a predictable fashion. Such questions will be examined in detail in the final report.

It would have been worthwhile to have tested all the participants during their senior year in high school prior to their submitting college applications to determine the extent to which college and curriculum choice has influenced their occupational identifications. However, this must be left for another study. This study is an attempt to determine differences based on the college and curriculum experience. Thus, relatively little has been determined thus far other than showing that the groups are different, many of these differences being consistent with the college and curriculum chosen. This data is, however, essential for the determination of change based on the two-year college experience for if we did not know where the students were to begin with we could not determine how much they had changed. Therefore, the data presented in this interim report is intended to serve as a baseline and not as an end to the data collection process. Its value will only be realized after the final data is collected and changes in occupational identification calculated. For this reason, no further generalizations will be made from the present data.

## APPENDIX

The Form of the Multiple Repertory Test (MRT)  
Used in This Study

OCCUPATIONS SCALE INSTRUCTIONS - PART A

On the following page, you will find descriptions of different kinds of occupations. Before each statement, there is a blank space. In each space, write the name of an occupation or job which best fits the description. Try to be specific rather than general. For example: use automobile mechanic rather than mechanic; use truck driver rather than driver; use electronics technician rather than technician; use chemical engineer rather than engineer.

DO NOT LIST THE SAME OCCUPATIONAL NAME OR JOB MORE THAN ONCE

BE SURE TO FILL IN EACH BLANK



Code: \_\_\_\_\_

- \_\_\_\_\_ (1) The occupation in which you are presently employed or are presently studying.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2) An occupation where you wouldn't have to worry very much about losing your job even in hard times.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (3) An occupation in which you could make a lot of money.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (4) An occupation in which you could invent, design, or develop new things or ideas.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (5) An occupation in which there are many contacts with people.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (6) An occupation where you could know by the results when you've done a good job.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (7) An occupation where you could be a person who is looked up to.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (8) An occupation in which you can do things your own way.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (9) An occupation that you would find very distasteful or unpleasant.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (10) An occupation in which you would have clear rules and regulations to follow and good supervision.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (11) An occupation in which you would be able to rise to a position of leadership..

**STOP**

## PART B

On the following page, the letters A through L are listed. In the center column, next to each of these letters, there is a group of three numbers. These numbers refer to the occupations which you have listed in Part A on the previous page.

For each of these groups of three occupations, you are to think of an important way in which two of these three occupations are alike, and, at the same time, different from the third. Be sure to think of only an important way in which two of the occupations are alike.

When you have decided in what way two of the three occupations are alike, write the word or phrase which expresses that similarity or likeness in the space provided in the column headed **SIMILARITY**.

Next, draw circles around the two numbers which represent the two occupations which are alike. Then, in the space under **OPPOSITE** on the same line, write a word or a phrase which is the opposite of the word or phrase which you wrote under **SIMILARITY**. Do not write a word or phrase which describes the occupation which is different from the other two. Write only a word or phrase which is the opposite of the one you wrote under **SIMILARITY**.

### Illustrative examples:

#### Example 1:

Assume you have been watching three men at work. You are asked to think of an important way two of their jobs are alike, but different from the third. You noticed that two were actively moving things around, the third was seated and apparently making notes about what the others moved. So you might write active as the way in which two were alike, but different from the third. Asked to give the opposite perhaps you would write quiet or unmoving. Here you are asked to write under **SIMILARITY** the way in which two people are alike, but, different from the third, and then to write under **OPPOSITE** the opposite of that word.

#### Example 2:

Suppose two of the occupations being compared were astronaut and racing car driver and the third was librarian. You might decide that the first two were alike in that both were interesting and would therefore write the word "interesting" in the column headed **SIMILARITY**. In the **OPPOSITE** column you would then write boring because this is the opposite of "interesting." On the other hand, you might judge the first and last to be alike in that both are trained in school, while the racing car driver is not. The opposite would be not trained in school. As you can see, there may be more than one basis for similarity among occupations. Choose the one that seems most important to you.

Code: \_\_\_\_\_

**PART B**

## SIMILARITY

**OPPOSITE**

[illegible]

A. 5. 11. 7

B. 9. 3. 1

C. 6. 11. 1

D. 3. 11. 8

E. 6. 3. 5

F. 4. 7. 6

G. 2. 8. 7

H. 10. 11. 9

I. 6. 8. 10

J. 9. 2. 4

K. 5. 8. 4

L? 3. 2. 10

[illegible]

## PART C

Attached to this sheet of instructions there are several strips called WORD RATING FORMS. Each WORD RATING FORM has a TITLE printed at the top. You are asked to judge each of the TITLES against the words or phrases (A through L) which you have written on Part B of the test.

For example, suppose the TITLE of the first WORD RATING FORM is Astronaut, and suppose that the response you have recorded on line A is Quiet ... Noisy. If you feel that the adjective "Quiet" is very appropriate for describing "Astronaut," i.e., it is much more appropriate than "Noisy" is, you would check as follows:

### ASTRONAUT

Quiet ☒:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: Noisy

On the other hand, if you feel that "Noisy" is slightly more appropriate for describing "Astronaut" than Quiet is, you would check as follows:

Quiet \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: ☒:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: Noisy

If either adjective seems to you to be more appropriate than the other for describing "Astronaut," you would check as follows:

Quiet \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: ☒:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: Noisy

You may indicate your response by placing a check mark in any one of the seven spaces, but please be sure to place your check mark in the center of the space so it is clear which space you mean to check.

Follow this same procedure for each word or phrase, A through L. Be sure to complete each item. Then check each one of the WORD RATING FORMS in the same way.

It is better to work rapidly without puzzling over individual items. Remember that each WORD RATING FORM has a different TITLE, so be sure to keep the TITLE in mind as you check. It will be better if you look at the TITLE of each WORD RATING FORM only when you are ready to check it. When you complete one WORD RATING FORM, fold it back at the staple and go on to the next one.

Detach this instruction sheet from the WORD RATING FORMS. Then place the WORD RATING FORMS over the center column of Part B so that each letter (A through L) on the WORD RATING FORM is next to the same letter on the page. This will result in "bridging" each SIMILARITY ... OPPOSITE with a seven point scale.



**POLICEMAN OR FIREMAN**

I \_\_\_\_\_

I AM  
I WISH I WERE  
ELECTRICIAN OR PLUMBER  
MEMBER OF HIGH SOCIETY  
TEACHER  
ACCOUNTANT (CPA)  
CLERK  
OUTSTANDING CITIZEN  
SALESMAN  
DOCTOR  
TRUCK DRIVER OR DELIVERYMAN  
CULTURED PERSON  
MECHANIC OR MACHINIST  
ENGINEER  
COMMUNITY LEADER  
TECHNICIAN  
BUSINESS EXECUTIVE  
BOOKKEEPER  
LAWYER  
POLICEMAN OR FIREMAN

TABLE A

Rank-Ordering of the Discrepancy Score and Means for the Middlesex County College Technical Students (N=63) on the Fourteen Occupations

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Occupation</u>
(1)	18.52*	Technician
(2)	18.93	Engineer
(3)	20.30	Business Executive
(4)	20.77	Doctor
(5)	21.55	Teacher
(6)	21.79	Lawyer
(7)	21.90	Accountant
(8)	22.19	Electrician/Plumber
(9)	23.11	Mechanic/Machinist
(10)	23.19	Bookkeeper
(11)	24.07	Salesman
(12)	24.69	Policeman/Fireman
(13)	25.60	Clerk
(14)	29.80	Truck driver/Deliveryman

\* The lower the mean discrepancy score, the more similar the group perceives itself to be to the occupation.

TABLE B

Rank-Ordering of the Discrepancy Score and Means for the Middlesex County College Business students (N=117) on the Fourteen Occupations

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Occupation</u>
(1)	20.33	Business Executive
(2)	20.71	Bookkeeper
(3)	21.36	Accountant
(4)	21.61	Teacher
(5)	21.70	Salesman
(6)	21.82	Technician
(7)	22.38	Lawyer
(8)	22.83	Electrician/Plumber
(9)	22.83	Engineer
(10)	23.35	Policeman/Fireman
(11)	23.38	Clerk
(12)	24.20	Doctor
(13)	24.95	Mechanic/Machinist
(14)	28.31	Truck driver/Deliveryman

TABLE C

Rank-Ordering of the Discrepancy Score and Means for the Middlesex County College Pre-Technical Students (N=51) on the Fourteen Occupations

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Occupation</u>
(1)	21.00	Salesman
(2)	21.66	Clerk
(3)	22.11	Technician
(4)	22.14	Bookkeeper
(5)	22.80	Electrician/Plumber
(6)	22.94	Policeman/Fireman
(7)	23.15	Mechanic/Machinist
(8)	23.26	Business Executive
(9)	23.49	Accountant
(10)	23.68	Engineer
(11)	24.09	Teacher
(12)	28.12	Truck driver/Deliveryman
(13)	25.17	Lawyer
(14)	25.29	Doctor

TABLE D

Rank-Ordering of the Discrepancy Score and Means for the Middlesex County College Liberal Arts Students (N=74) on the Fourteen Occupations

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Occupation</u>
(1)	21.75	Teacher
(2)	22.18	Salesman
(3)	22.74	Technician
(4)	22.95	Engineer
(5)	23.32	Doctor
(6)	23.75	Business Executive
(7)	24.16	Lawyer
(8)	24.62	Clerk
(9)	24.83	Accountant
(10)	24.98	Policeman/Fireman
(11)	25.34	Bookkeeper
(12)	25.51	Electrician/Plumber
(13)	26.02	Mechanic/Machinist
(14)	28.27	Truck driver/Deliveryman

TABLE E

Rank-Ordering of the Discrepancy Score and Means for the Rutgers College Students (N=93) on the Fourteen Occupations

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Occupation</u>
(1)	21.76	Technician
(2)	22.31	Teacher
(3)	22.75	Lawyer
(4)	23.00	Doctor
(5)	23.58	Engineer
(6)	23.97	Business Executive
(7)	25.39	Accountant
(8)	26.69	Salesman
(9)	26.90	Mechanic/Machinist
(10)	27.02	Policeman/Fireman
(11)	27.04	Bookkeeper
(12)	27.82	Electrician/Plumber
(13)	30.21	Clerk
(14)	32.59	Truck driver/Deliveryman

TABLE F

Rank-Ordering of the Discrepancy Score and Means for the Non-College Students (N=35) on the Fourteen Occupations

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Occupation</u>
(1)	24.17	Teacher
(2)	24.57	Engineer
(3)	24.62	Technician
(4)	24.91	Salesman
(5)	24.94	Business Executive
(6)	25.00	Electrician/Plumber
(7)	25.48	Mechanic/Machinist
(8)	26.17	Policeman/Fireman
(9)	26.20	Lawyer
(10)	26.31	Bookkeeper
(11)	26.54	Doctor
(12)	27.82	Clerk
(13)	28.14	Accountant
(14)	30.88	Truck driver/Deliveryman